

SUBJECT: ABILITY OF CHIROPRACTORS TO PERFORM EXAMINATIONS

The following is an opinion written by Assistant Attorney General Robert Holley, in answer to the question of the breadth of examinations permitted by the scope of practice for Doctors of Chiropractic. The opinion is dated February 21, 1995

STATE OF MINNESOTA
Office of the Attorney General

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE

**THIS MEMORANDUM IS SUBJECT TO THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE
AND PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE. THE BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC
EXAMINERS MAY WAIVE THE PRIVILEGE BY THE VOTE OF A MAJORITY
OF A QUORUM. TO PREVENT UNINTENTIONAL WAIVER OF THE PRIVILEGE,
BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF SHOULD NOT DISTRIBUTE COPIES TO OTHERS.**

TO : LARRY A. SPICER, D.C.
Executive Director
Board of Chiropractic Examiners

DATE : February 21, 1995

FROM : ROBERT T. HOLLEY *RTH*
Assistant Attorney General

PHONE : 297-5938 (Voice)
282-2525 (TDD)

SUBJECT : **Authority of Chiropractors to Perform
Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDot)
Physical Examinations**

On December 8, 1994, the Board requested an opinion regarding the authority of chiropractors licensed to practice in Minnesota to sign the physical examination certificate required by MnDot for the operation of commercial motor vehicles. In a memorandum, dated December 20, 1994, you confirmed the Board's request and asked that my response take various materials and information into consideration.

ISSUE

The physical examination required by MnDot to operate a commercial motor vehicle is prescribed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). See Minn. R. 8850.7100

(1993). FHWA regulations provide that "a person shall not drive a motor vehicle unless he is physically qualified to do so and. . . has on his person the original, or a photographic copy, of a medical examiner's certificate that he is physically qualified to drive a motor vehicle." 49 C.F.R. § 391.41 (1993). The required examination must be performed by a licensed "health care professional." *Id.* at section 391.43(a)(1). FHWA regulations define health care professional as:

[A] person who is licensed, certified and/or registered, in accordance with applicable State laws and regulations, to perform physical examinations. The term includes, but is not limited to, doctors of medicine, doctors of osteopathy, physician assistants, advanced practice nurses, and doctors of chiropractic.

(Emphasis added.) *Id.* section 390.5. Based on the foregoing, the sole question presented is whether chiropractors licensed to practice in Minnesota are authorized by state law to perform the MnDot physical examination.

ANALYSIS

Minn. Stat. Section 148.08, Subd. 2

In most relevant part, the chiropractic practice act provides as follows:

Chiropractors shall be subject to the same rules and regulations, both municipal and state, that govern other licensed doctors or physicians in the control of contagious and infectious diseases, and shall be entitled to sign health and death certificates, and to all rights and privileges of other doctors or physicians in all matters pertaining to the public health, except prescribing internal drugs or the practice of medicine, physical therapy, surgery and obstetrics.

(Emphasis added.) Minn. Stat. §148.08, subd. 2 (1994).

The term health certificate is not defined in the act. Absent a special meaning, statutory words and phrases are to be construed according to their common and approved usage. Minn. Stat. § 645.08(1) (1994). Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1992, p. 617, defines "health" as "the general condition of the body or mind with reference to soundness or vigor . . . [and] freedom from disease or ailment." A "certificate" is "a

document providing evidence of status or qualifications, as one attesting to the . . . truth of facts stated." Id. p. 222.

The MnDot physical examination form is designed to record the physical condition or health of a commercial motor vehicle driver. 49 C.F.R. § 391.43(e). The form includes a "Medical Examiners Certificate" section to be signed by the examining health care professional to verify the findings of the physical examination. Id. That the MnDot examination form may reasonably be regarded as a health certificate within the meaning of Minn. Stat. § 148.08, subd. 2, is evident.

An elementary tenet of statutory construction is that when the words of a law are clear and unambiguous, effect must be given to the plain meaning of the language. Minn. Stat. § 645.16 (1994). Likewise, the Minnesota Supreme Court has held that "a statute must be enforced literally if its language embodies a definite meaning which involves no absurdity or contradiction, the statute being its own best expositor." City of St. Louis Park v. King, 246 Minn. 422, 75 N.W.2d 487, 492 (1956). In the present case, the language in question conveys a definite meaning and presents no apparent absurdity or contradiction. Thus, on its face, section 148.08, subd. 2, authorizes chiropractors to sign health certificates, including the MnDot physical examination form.¹ Such authority clearly indicates an intent on the part of the Legislature to permit chiropractors to conduct the physical examination that underlies execution of the health certificate.

1. The available history of section 148.08, subd. 2, appears to support a literal interpretation. The language authorizing chiropractors to sign health and death certificates was adopted in 1927 as an amendment to section 8 of the original chiropractic practice act of 1919. Minn. Laws, ch. 230, sec. 1. The amendment was seemingly adopted, at least in part, as a response to the Minnesota Supreme Court's decision in Wentworth v. Fahey, 152 Minn. 220, 188 N.W. 260 (1922), which denied chiropractors the right to sign death certificates. Committee records indicate that the 1927 enactment was supported by the Board, but opposed by the State Board of Health and the Mayo Clinic. Legislative House Committee, Committee on Public Health and Hospitals, pp. 23, 24. The underlying bill, H.F. 464, was passed out of Committee on a 4-3 vote following unsuccessful motions to eliminate certificate authority for chiropractors and to indefinitely postpone the bill. Id. at p. 24.

Scope of Practice

Notwithstanding the preceding evidence that the facial meaning of section 148.08, subd. 2, provides broad health certificate authority, 1969 and 1975 Minnesota Attorney General's opinions and a 1975 judicial decision raised doubts with regard to chiropractors' general authority to diagnose and to use certain instrumentalities. Absent the authority to diagnose conditions in addition to those treatable by chiropractic, it is arguable that certain tests required to complete standard physical examination forms cannot be conducted by Minnesota chiropractors. It follows that if the use of certain diagnostic procedures required to conduct a physical examination is denied, the breadth of a chiropractor's authority to sign health certificates may be restricted.

The 1969 attorney general's opinion was issued in response to a number of questions posed by the Board of Medical Examiners concerning the scope of chiropractic practice. Op. Atty. Gen. 303c-2 (Oct. 21, 1969).² Pertinent to the present inquiry was whether a Minnesota licensed chiropractor could use urological and hematological analysis or blood pressure tests for diagnostic purposes. The Attorney General concluded that chiropractors are trained to administer such tests, but that they may be used only to diagnose "abnormal articulations" treatable in accordance with the scope of practice provisions of Minn. Stat. § 148.01, subd. 1.

A second significant legal development which raised questions about the permissible scope of chiropractic practice arose from the case of State Board of Medical Examiners v. Richard E. Olson, Court File No. 38217, 7th Judicial District (Jan. 28, 1975); Audio tape, House Health and Welfare Committee Meeting, April 18, 1975. Dr. Olson, a chiropractor, was sued for allegedly engaging in the unauthorized practice of medicine by reason of his use of muscle stimulator devices, ultrasound, and a short-wave diathermy machine. On remand from the Minnesota Supreme Court on procedural grounds (295 Minn. 379, 206 N.W.2d 12

2. The Board of Medical Examiners was renamed the Board of Medical Practice in 1991. Minn. Laws 1991, ch. 106, § 6.

(1973), Stearns County District Court Judge Paul Hoffman interpreted the original chiropractic practice act of 1919 as not providing authority for use of the devices in question by chiropractors. He further found that use of the devices should be preceded by a careful medical diagnosis.³

In a 1975 opinion issued in response to questions by the Board of Medical Examiners concerning the practice of acupuncture, the Attorney General referenced his 1969 opinion on chiropractic by reaffirming that the circumstances under which a chiropractor could perform blood, urine and blood pressure tests were limited. Op. Atty. Gen. 303c-2 (March 10, 1975).

Finally, later in 1975, interested organizations sought legislation to clarify the scope of chiropractic practice, which some viewed as having become increasingly uncertain or restricted. Committee tapes reveal that an extensive legislative proceeding regarding the parameters of diagnosis focused on whether chiropractors should be permitted to diagnose only those conditions which are treatable by chiropractic means or whether a considerably broader authority, possibly including unlimited differential diagnosis, is appropriate. Following more than four hours of testimony and debate on two separate days in the House Subcommittee on Health Care, the final version of a bill, H.F. 534, was recommended to pass. Minutes, House Subcommittee on Health Care Meeting, April 10, 1975. It was enacted without significant modifications and, in most relevant part, codified as Minn. Stat. § 148.01, subd. 3. That portion of the 1975 legislation which relates most directly to diagnosis has not been altered since its adoption. It provides as follows:

Chiropractic practice includes those non-invasive means of clinical, physical, and laboratory measures and analytical x-ray of the bones of the skeleton which are necessary to make a determination of the presence or absence of a chiropractic condition.

3. It is understood that the lower court's final decision in 1975 was appealed, but by stipulation of the parties, the appeal was dismissed by the Minnesota Supreme Court on October 3, 1975.

Legislative History of Section 148.01, subd. 3

Section 148.01, subd. 3, may be subject to varying interpretations relative to whether the diagnostic procedures authorized under the section are limited to the detection of chiropractic conditions or have a broader application. Legislative records are instructive regarding the development and meaning of the statutory language.⁴ Representative Bruce Vento, the chief sponsor of H.F. 534, explained its general purpose as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, for the past seven years the Minnesota courts and legislature have been facing a controversy surrounding the definition of chiropractic in the state. Because of the direction that the court had attempted to provide us with regard to the scope of chiropractic, as a result of the more recent decision, it did limit it very severely and obviously not consistent with the way that chiropractic has evolved to serve the needs of the constituents that we represent. In quoting from one of the decisions by Judge Hoffman:

"The basic problem in the interpretation of an old statute is that it was enacted before the devices in question were known or used. The court feels the statute was restrictive and has so interpreted it. If it is to be broadened in its scope or application, it appears that this should be done by the legislature."

That's the reason we brought the bill before you, because the way chiropractic is practiced today is not the same as it was in 1919 when the pages of the books with regard to the scope of chiropractic practice took place. . . . This amendment will help the patient who seeks a chiropractor for treatment, and he is entitled to the best care he can receive. The amendment will permit the profession and art of chiropractic to continue as it has in the past.

4. When the words of a statute are not explicit, legislative intent may be determined by considering contemporaneous legislative history. Minn. Stat. § 645.16(7) (1994). The Minnesota Supreme Court has also observed that selective use of statements made in the give and take of the legislative process is risky and that statements made in committee discussion are to be treated with caution. Handle With Care, Inc. v. Department of Human Services, 406 N.W.2d 518, 522 (1987). Nevertheless, consideration of the tapes of committee and floor sessions is authorized to determine legislative intent by the examination of contemporaneous legislative history and, in the Court's view, should not be ignored if helpful to an understanding of legislative intent. See id.

Audio tape, House Health and Welfare Committee Meeting, April 18, 1975. Representative Byrne, a member of the House Subcommittee on Health Care, expressed a similar understanding of the overall purpose of the legislation:

What we're trying to do is set up language here that will not take away any of the present powers that the chiropractors have now. Right? We're just trying to give them what they're doing now.

Audio tape, House Subcommittee on Health Care Meeting, April 10, 1975.

The original version of Rep. Vento's bill stated that "[c]hiropractic diagnosis may include clinical, physical, x-ray, and routine laboratory measures necessary to make a differential diagnosis." Minutes, House Subcommittee on Health Care Meeting, April 8, 1975. H.F. 870, a competing measure introduced by Representative Enebo, would seemingly have limited chiropractic diagnosis to "examining and locating misaligned articulations or displaced vertebrae of the human spine" Id. The Vento bill was amended during the first day of Subcommittee hearings to read as follows relative to diagnosis:

"Chiropractic diagnosis may include clinical, physical, x-ray and routine laboratory measures necessary to make a chiropractic diagnosis to determine the necessity for chiropractic care or referral to another health care provider. Id.

Representative Vento explained his amended proposal as follows:

Clarifying that a chiropractor can use diagnostic procedures simply means that if he sees that there's something wrong with a person, that he cannot provide a service for that patient, that he can direct that person to see a physician. That's what we mean by "diagnosis." I think that that's important. I don't think that we want a chiropractor not to be able to diagnose, to suggest that someone see a doctor about a particular problem. I think that this would permit them to do that.

Audio tape, House Subcommittee on Health Care Meeting, April 8, 1975. Dr. John F. Allenburg, the Dean of Clinics at Northwestern College of Chiropractic in St. Paul,⁵

5. Dr. Allenburg is the current president of Northwestern College of Chiropractic, which is now located in Bloomington, Minnesota.

elaborated on the importance of a diagnosis which may uncover conditions which are not necessarily treatable by chiropractic:

An intelligent diagnosis is the foundation of all rational treatment. He [the chiropractic student] learns that only accurate diagnosis can insure the patient will receive the proper type of treatment administered by the type of doctor most qualified to care for his or her ailment and that valuable time and expense will not be wasted with incorrect therapies when referral may have been indicated.

Furthermore, the student learns that he or she is required to state a correct diagnosis for insurance companies in order that patients may be properly reimbursed, by attorneys representing client-patients, and by the courts when called upon to testify regarding injured patients. The student understands that he or she could be guilty of malpractice or negligence if a patient were to suffer because of diagnostic error on his or her part.

Physical, laboratory and x-ray diagnostic procedures are especially necessary to distinguish those cases which may be treated by doctors of chiropractic from those which should be referred to other health providers. For example, many internal organ diseases may lead to musculoskeletal pain through irritated neuromechanisms. Heart diseases may cause shoulder and arm pain. Gallbladder disorders may cause pain over the spine between the shoulder blades. Pancreas disorders may cause back pain while lying down. Back pain may also be caused by bone marrow disease, kidney disease and prostate disease. Only by utilizing the appropriate blood and urine tests, physical findings and radiographs can the above disorders be distinguished from pain due to abnormal articulations so that appropriate referrals may be made. Spinal joint malalignments themselves can only be positively identified and classified through radiographic examination.

Id.

Opposition was voiced on behalf of the State Board of Medical Examiners by Sidney Berde, who served as legal counsel for that agency in the Olson case:

The bill which is now before the Subcommittee would expand the practice of chiropractic to include every diagnostic procedure known to the medical profession. If carefully read, that's what it does. So long as some chiropractor determines that such diagnostic procedure is "necessary to make a diagnosis to

determine the necessity of chiropractic care or referral to another health care provider" that chiropractor, if he can make that determination, would be free under this bill to pursue that clinical or laboratory diagnosis. The bill would permit chiropractors to engage in diagnostic procedures that many medical specialists would hesitate to perform. The amended language is broader than anything that has heretofore been brought before this Committee. It should be rejected out of hand, because if adopted, it would place no limits whatsoever on the scope of clinical diagnosis, so-called, available to chiropractors.

Id. Likewise, Chester A. Anderson, M.D., spoke in opposition to H.F. 534 on behalf of the Minnesota Medical Association:

What then is necessary for a chiropractor to make his diagnosis? Frankly, two things: A physical examination and an x-ray of the spinal column. I am sure every orthodox chiropractor would say this was sufficient. They are trained to make this kind of diagnosis, then to follow up with chiropractic adjustment. This privilege they already have under statutes.

Now we have a bill, H.F. 534, which would allow the chiropractors to literally slip into the practice of medicine to the differential diagnosis. And I quote, "Chiropractic diagnosis may involve medical, physical, x-ray and routine laboratory measures necessary to make a differential diagnosis." The amendment offered is rephrased as the same statement. This could be interpreted then to mean skull x-rays, extremity x-rays, mammography, soft tissue x-rays using barium contrast for colon studies, stomach studies, contrast dyes for kidney studies, arteriogram studies, pneumoencephalogram, nuclear x-ray studies, including brain scans. . . . You could go on and on. . . .

Routine laboratory measures. What are these? Are they just (inaudible) hemoglobins and blood sugars? Or are they liver profiles or enzyme profiles, thyroid function tests, electrolyte balances, blood chemistries, which are used normally in certain medical examinations to rule in or out a medical disease that can be treated medically. . . . In conclusion, gentlemen, the present statutes are adequate to allow these people to practice their profession with dignity and honesty. We particularly see no reason for the passage of the present bill under consideration.

Id.

Subcommittee hearings on April 10, 1975, resulted in another amendment of the bill's diagnostic provision. The new language provided as follows:

Chiropractic practice includes those routine, clinical, physical, analytical x-ray, and laboratory measures which are necessary to make a determination of the presence or absence of a chiropractic condition.

Minutes, House Subcommittee on Health Care Meeting, April 10, 1975. Representative Vento indicated that he did not regard the new language as conveying a meaning any different from that set forth in the previous version or the language he originally introduced. Audio tape, House Subcommittee on Health Care Meeting, April 10, 1975. Curtis Forsland, an attorney representing the Board of Medical Examiners, offered similar observations:

Basically, I agree with Representative Vento that the bill is not different except in semantics from the one that was offered originally. For example, the word "diagnosis," to which there was apparently substantial objection, has been stricken from the original bill and the substantive word that's used is the word "determination." I think we are playing there with semantics. To make a determination is to make a diagnosis as I understand it.

Id. Representative Linda Berglin also commented on the amendment:

It seems to me that the first part of this amendment leaves out a couple of words that we have in the other amendment but basically allows the same kinds of things to happen in the area of clinical, physical, analytic x-ray and laboratory measures. We're not talking about "diagnosis" now but we're still allowing all of the things to happen. . . The only thing we're not allowing in here as I see it is those things which are not routine. I'm not sure what those things are.

Id.

Final amendments to H.F. 534 were adopted during the Subcommittee hearing on April 10, 1975, based largely on the testimony of physiologist Dr. William Kubicek, of the University of Minnesota Hospitals. The Subcommittee substituted "non-invasive" for "routine" relative to permissible clinical, physical and laboratory diagnostic procedures and

limited diagnosis by x-ray to "the bones of the skeleton." Id.; Minutes, House Subcommittee on Health Care Meeting, April 10, 1975. Dr. Kubicek specifically advised the Subcommittee that the inclusion of "non-invasive" would prohibit spinal taps by chiropractors and that the x-ray restriction would prohibit chiropractors from x-raying abdominal content. As has been noted, H.F. 534 was enacted without significant change concerning diagnostic authority in the same form in which the Subcommittee approved the bill on April 10, 1975. No action was taken on H.F. 870, the proposal which would have limited diagnoses to procedures used to detect only conditions treatable by chiropractic. Minutes, House Subcommittee on Health Care Meeting, April 10, 1975. The current scope of chiropractic diagnosis continues to be defined by H.F. 534, codified as Minn. Stat. § 148.01, subd. 3.

Thus, a review of all available tapes discloses that the appropriate scope of chiropractic diagnosis was fully aired in 1975, including lengthy testimony regarding the extent and nature of chiropractic education and license examination requirements.⁶ The Legislature was presented with radically divergent options, namely, to restrict diagnosis under H.F. 870 to those procedures designed to detect only conditions treatable by chiropractic or to permit an unlimited differential diagnosis like that available to medical doctors. The restricted diagnosis option was not enacted. At the same time, certain specific limitations were imposed to deny chiropractors the right to engage in unrestricted differential diagnosis. Those limitations are defined by Dr. Kubicek's proposals concerning the use of only non-invasive procedures and the limitation of x-ray analysis to the bones of the skeleton. The history of section 148.01, subd. 3, supports a conclusion that the Legislature intended to impose no other limitations.

6. Dr. John F. Allenburg, among others, provided extensive detail regarding chiropractic college accreditation standards and the education of chiropractic students, including the training provided in diagnosis. Audio tape, House Subcommittee on Health Care Meeting, April 8, 1975. Similarly, Dr. August Schaub, a member of the Board in 1975, provided details regarding the subjects covered in the National Chiropractic Board Examination and the state licensing examination. Id.

The basic MnDot physical examination does not appear to require the use of invasive diagnostic procedures or analytical x-rays not involving the bones of the skeleton. MnDot examination requirements specifically include the taking of a health history, an evaluation of the patient's general appearance and development, vision testing, a hearing test, an examination of the throat and thorax, blood pressure and pulse readings, an examination of the lungs, abdomen and gastrointestinal system, urinalysis, reflex tests, including knee jerks, an examination of the extremities and any additional indicated laboratory tests. Id. at 49 C.F.R. § 391.43.⁷ None of these procedures is seemingly beyond the scope of practice under section 148.01, subd. 3. In addition, all appear to be well within the training of doctors of chiropractic.⁸ Similarly, the examination for licensure in Minnesota evidently requires mastery of the several procedures necessary to perform a MnDot physical examination.⁹

7. Where indicated by the patient's history, a more stringent examination might be necessary. 49 C.F.R. § 391.43.

8. Materials and information provided in conjunction with the Board's opinion request show that chiropractors are trained to perform each of the MnDot examination procedures and tests. It is noted, for example, that Northwestern College of Chiropractic, which meets national accreditation standards and from which the great majority of Minnesota's licensees has graduated, offers the following diagnostic courses, among others: the examination, diagnosis, and pathophysiology of the eyes, ears, nose and throat; the use of traditional diagnostic instruments, including the stethoscope, sphygmomanometer, otoscope and ophthalmoscope; the conduct of the complete nonneuromusculoskeletal physical examination, including history, inspection, palpation, auscultation and mensuration; differential diagnosis of central nervous system disorders; diagnoses of the clinical conditions associated with the gastrointestinal tract; differential diagnoses of endocrinopathies; diagnoses of the clinical conditions associated with the urinary tract; diagnoses of musculoskeletal conditions of the upper and lower extremities; basic diagnostic approaches to common respiratory disorders; radiographic technology and positioning; clinical hematology and urinalysis; dermatology; management of hypertension, diabetes, asthma and cardiovascular disease; and assessment and early care of emergencies, including wounds, fractures, hemorrhages, shock, apoplexy, cardiopulmonary crisis and diabetic reactions.

Memorandum, December 20, 1994.

9. Minnesota licensure requires passage of Parts II and III of the National Board of Chiropractic Examiners examination. Minn. R. 2500.0720. Parts II and III include extensive testing in the following and numerous other subjects: case history; vital signs; head and neck examination; thorax and lung examination; cardiovascular examination; (Footnote 9 continued on next page)

If the circumstances presented by an individual applicant indicate the need for a more stringent examination, FHWA regulations permit referral to a specialist. See id. A discussion of the referral process published by the FHWA in conjunction with its adoption of the regulations states in most relevant part as follows:

These health care professionals [chiropractors] are licensed, registered, and/or certified under their State statutes to perform physical examinations. Chiropractors are also required to refer any patient, with any condition(s) outside the scope of their practice, to MDs, DOs and/or other medical specialists. This is consistent with what other medical practitioners do in this age of specialization. . . .

The physical examination does not require sophisticated diagnosis or treatment. In the event that such diagnostic analysis is required, the FHWA would expect the health care professional, consistent with sound medical practices, to promptly refer the patient to the appropriate health care specialist.

57 Fed. Reg. p. 33277 (July 28, 1992). The referral process authorized by the FHWA would appear to be consistent with testimony regarding modern chiropractic practices in Minnesota which preceded the adoption of section 148.01, subd. 3. See supra at pp. 7-8. It is also noted that FHWA regulations specifically allow the examining health care professional to order studies pertaining to laboratory and other special findings. 49 C.F.R. § 391.43. If dictated by the requirements of a particular case, such studies seemingly could include invasive procedures or special x-ray studies. See id.

Analogous Health Certificate Authority

The authority of Minnesota chiropractors to sign MnDot health certificates under sections 148.01, subd. 3 and 148.08, subd. 2, is also supported by analogous legislation

(footnote 9 continued)

abdominal examination; rectal and urogenital examination; clinical diagnosis, including head, eyes, ears, nose and throat; respiratory diseases; cardiovascular diseases; gastrointestinal diseases; genitourinary diseases; infectious diseases; laboratory interpretation, including urinalysis, hematology and serology; orthopedic examination, including the extremities; neurologic examination, including sensory function and reflexes, and sexually transmitted diseases. Id.

relating to physical examinations for parking privileges for the physically disabled. The Legislature has expressly authorized doctors of chiropractic to perform physical examinations and sign health certificates in conjunction with parking privileges for physically disabled persons. Minn. Stat. § 169.345 (1994) in pertinent parts provides as follows:

The commissioner shall develop a form for the physician's or chiropractor's statement. The statement must be signed by a licensed physician or chiropractor who certifies that the applicant is a physically disabled person as defined in subdivision 2. The commissioner may request additional information from the physician or chiropractor if needed to verify the applicant's eligibility. The statement that the applicant is a physically disabled person must specify whether the disability is permanent or temporary, and if temporary, the opinion of the physician or chiropractor as to the duration of the disability.

Subd. 2a. (Emphasis added.) The foregoing provisions relating to chiropractors have been in effect since 1988. Minn. Laws 1988, ch. 642, § § 7, 8.

A disability parking certificate requires an examination and diagnosis relating to the heart, lungs and other systems. Minn. Stat. § 169.345, subd. 2 (1994); Department of Public Safety form PS-2005-16. Neither the underlying statute nor any discovered administrative rule restricts the required examination and diagnosis to conditions treatable by chiropractic when the examinations are performed by a chiropractor. See id.

Statutes which relate to the same general subject are referred to as being in pari materia ("upon the same matter or subject"). Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Ed., Continental Ed. (1891-1991), p. 791. A fundamental rule of statutory construction provides that when a particular statute is ambiguous, statutes which are in pari materia should be read, construed and applied together so that the Legislature's intent can be ascertained from the whole of its enactments. Id.; Minn. Stat. § 645.16(5) (1994); see e.g., Hahn v. City of Ortonville, 238 Minn. 428, 57 N.W.2d 254, 261 (1953). Minnesota Statutes § § 148.01, subd. 3, 148.08, subd. 2, and 169.345 all relate to a chiropractor's authority to conduct examinations and to sign related health certificates. Accordingly, the statutes seemingly are in pari materia.

Under the circumstances, if section 148.01, subd. 3 or section 148.08, subd. 2, is ambiguous relative to the extent of a chiropractor's authority to diagnose for purposes of signing health certificates, it is appropriate to consider related laws to determine the Legislature's intent. Once again, there is no indication under section 169.345 that the Legislature intended to limit chiropractic diagnosis to conditions treatable only by chiropractic means. This conclusion is consistent with the facial absence of any such limitation under section 148.08, subd. 2.¹⁰

Administrative Construction

An additional basis for the conclusion that doctors of chiropractic licensed in Minnesota may perform the MnDot physical examination is found in the longstanding administrative construction of the Board. When the words of a statute are not explicit, legislative intent may be determined by considering, among other things, administrative interpretations of the law. Minn. Stat. § 645.16(8) (1994). The weight to be given such interpretations increases when the agency is construing a statute which it is charged to administer and the construction is longstanding. E.g., McAfee v. Department of Revenue, 514 N.W.2d 301 (Minn. Ct. App. 1994) rev. den..

On a number of occasions the Board has enforced the disciplinary provisions of chapter 148 or taken corrective action¹¹ to require licensees to utilize standard (non-invasive)

-
10. It should also be noted that workers' compensation legislation recognizes a chiropractor's authority to perform examinations, diagnose and submit reports relative to injured employees for purposes of compensation. See Minn. Stat. § § 176.011, subd. 24, 176.135, 176.55, subd. 5, 176.231, subd. 3 (1994). Among other things, rules of the Department of Labor and Industry expressly authorize the payment of fees for a chiropractor's "review of diagnostic tests to diagnose disease" and for the "examination of multiple body systems." Id. at Minn. R. 5221.2900, subp. 1a.A. Rules first adopted in 1984 authorize the payment of specific fees for chiropractic services which include muscle stimulation, ultrasound, diathermy and acupuncture. Id. subps. 2, 4; 9 SR 601 (Sept. 17, 1984). Prior to the enactment of Minn. Stat. § 148.01, subd. 3, in 1975, each of the foregoing procedures had been declared to be beyond the scope of chiropractic practice under the Olson decision or under the previously discussed 1975 opinion of the Attorney General. See supra at pp. 4-5.
 11. Non-disciplinary corrective action is authorized relative to all health-related licensing boards. Minn. Stat. § 214.103, subds. 1, 6 (1994). Corrective action agreements are public documents. See Minn. Stat. § 13.41, subd. 4 (1994).

laboratory and other diagnostic procedures and to make referrals to other health care providers as appropriate. Board orders and agreements concerning the diagnostic procedures to be used have not been conditioned upon whether chiropractic, medical or other treatment may ultimately be required. Examples include cases involving the diagnosis of colon and shoulder problems (The matter of P.G., D.C., Jan. 22, 1985), chemical sensitivities (The matter of C.N., D.C., July 12, 1990), (The matter of E.S., D.C., July 23, 1992), miscellaneous physical symptoms (The matter of A.F., D.C., Dec. 15, 1993), and heart conditions (The matter of C.L., D.C., May 10, 1994). No disciplinary orders or corrective action agreements evidencing a required use of tests to detect only conditions treatable chiropractically have been discovered.

Similarly, the Board has administered the provision under section 148.08, subd. 2, granting the authority to "sign health and death certificates" since its adoption in 1927. Although the Board has not promulgated rules concerning the subject, it has on occasion construed the provision in question by the adoption of resolutions recorded in the official minutes of public meetings of the Board. In all discovered instances, the Board has endorsed the authority of Minnesota chiropractors to sign health and death certificates. E.g., Minutes, Board meetings of August 31, 1931, September 4, 1946, and September 21, 1974.

In accordance with earlier discussion, section 148.08, subd. 2, is seemingly clear on its face regarding health certificate authority. Should there be doubt, the Board's public orders and agreements in disciplinary and corrective action proceedings relative to necessary diagnostic procedures to be employed in physical examinations conducted by chiropractors are entitled to great weight as an aid to accurately ascertain legislative intent. Also entitled to weight are Board resolutions adopted over many years confirming the authority of chiropractors to issue certificates in a variety of circumstances.

The Medical Practice Act

Finally, you have asked me to examine the medical practice act for possible relevance to the present inquiry. In most pertinent part, that statute provides as follows:

Subd. 1. It is unlawful for any person not holding a valid license issued in accordance with this chapter to practice medicine as defined in subdivision 3 in this state.

....
Subd. 3. For purposes of this chapter, a person not exempted under section 147.09 is "practicing medicine" or engaged in the "practice of medicine" if the person does any of the following: . . .

(3) Offers or undertakes. . . to diagnose. . . in any manner or by any means, methods, devices or instrumentalities, any disease, illness, pain, wound, fracture, infirmity, deformity or defect of any person. . . .

Minn. Stat. § 147.081 (1994). Exemptions to the preceding under section 147.09 include the following:

Section 147.081 does not apply to, control, prevent or restrict the practice, service, or activities of:

....
(9) Any person licensed by a health related licensing board, as defined in section 214.01, subd. 2. . . ; provided that the person confines activities within the scope of the license.

The Board of Chiropractic Examiners is expressly identified as a health-related licensing board under section 214.01 (1994). Further, it is self-evident that physical examinations conducted by chiropractors in connection with the issuance of health certificates necessarily may involve the diagnosis of "disease, illness, pain, wound, fracture, infirmity, deformity or defect." Thus, the only question seemingly presented under the medical practice act in connection with this opinion is whether the activity is exempt under section 147.081(9) as being within the scope of a chiropractor's license.

The answer is dependent upon an interpretation of the scope of chiropractic defined under section 148.01 (1994). As has been addressed at some length above, it appears to have been the intent of the authors of section 148.01, subd. 3, to permit chiropractors to employ a

variety of diagnostic procedures commensurate with chiropractic education. That there may be a degree of overlap between the diagnostic procedures utilized by medicine and chiropractic is implicit in the exemption language of section 147.081(9). Whether a specific diagnostic procedure is exempt would depend upon facts of the particular case.¹²

CONCLUSION

Minn. Stat. § 148.08, subd. 2, provides plain, general authority for doctors of chiropractic licensed in this state to sign health certificates and to perform antecedent physical examinations. It is arguable that the permissible diagnostic procedures available relative to such examinations were once limited to the detection of conditions treatable by chiropractic.

However, in 1975, the Minnesota Legislature enacted section 148.01, subd. 3, to clarify the modern scope of practice which had evolved since the adoption of the chiropractic practice act in 1919. The section permits a differential diagnosis, with a prohibition respecting invasive procedures and a limitation concerning the use of analytic x-rays. The enactment codifies a chiropractor's role in diagnosing many physical conditions which the practitioner is not authorized or, perhaps, inclined to treat. Records from the 1975 legislative session confirm that in cases of the diagnosis of conditions not treatable chiropractically, it was intended that referrals to other health care providers occur.

The MnDot physical examination for commercial motor vehicle drivers is derived from FHWA regulations. Subject to state law, the regulations include doctors of chiropractic among those authorized to perform the required physical examinations. It is evident that no


12. Although no reported Minnesota cases have been discovered regarding the breadth of chiropractic diagnostic authority under Minn. Stat. § 148.01, subd. 3, the concept of overlap between medical and permissible chiropractic diagnostic procedures has been addressed elsewhere. E.g., Rosenberg v. Cahill, 492 A.2d 371 (N.J. 1985). A number of cases also exist relative to the liability of chiropractors for failure to diagnose conditions not necessarily treatable by chiropractic or to refer patients to a medical practitioner. E.g., Roberson v. Counselman, 686 P.2d 149 (Kan. 1984) (acute heart disease); Higgins v. Johnson, 434 S.2d 976 (Fla. App. 1983) (prostate malignancy). See Anno: Liability of chiropractors and other drugless practitioners for medical malpractice, 77 ALR 4th 273 (1990).

part of the basic MnDot examination would require a chiropractor to exceed the diagnostic authority granted under section 148.01, subd. 3 (1994). Moreover, any procedure that could exceed such authority is referable to a specialist. In fact, FHWA regulations specifically recognize the ability of the health care professional to order other tests as may be necessary. The education and training required of chiropractors, as evidenced by the materials provided by the Board, support the conclusion that chiropractors are authorized to sign the MnDot physical examination form. Indeed, it is evident that no element of the basic examination, which FHWA has described as not requiring sophisticated diagnosis, is beyond the training of a doctor of chiropractic licensed in this state.

Based on the foregoing, it is my opinion that under applicable state law doctors of chiropractic are authorized to execute the MnDot physical examination form. If clarification of any part of this opinion may be indicated, please let me know.

SUBJECT: ABILITY OF CHIROPRACTORS TO PERFORM EXAMINATIONS

The following is the opinion by the Deputy Attorney General Lucinda Jesson, confirming the February 21, 1995 opinion of Assistant Attorney General Robert Holley. This confirmatory opinion is dated April 28, 1997.



Minnesota Board of Chiropractic Examiners

February 26, 1996

Lucinda E. Jesson, Deputy Attorney General
525 Park Ave. Su. 500
St. Paul, MN 55103-2106

Dear Ms. Jesson,

As you are aware, the Attorney General's office has provided conflicting opinions to different clients regarding the authority of doctors of chiropractic to perform examinations required of truck drivers providing services under the jurisdiction of the Minnesota Department of transportation (MNDOT), a subdivision of the Minnesota Department of Public Safety (MNDPS). The two opinions in question are those of Melissa L. Wright, Assistant Attorney General, of May 27, 1994, as well as the opinion of Robert Holley, Assistant Attorney General submitted on February 21, 1995. This causes a dilemma for the MBCE in appropriately performing its functions.

For example, the MBCE has received at least one complaint against a doctor of chiropractic for performing the examination required of truck drivers operating under the authority of MNDOT. As you may well imagine, acting on such a complaint can be problematic when faced with conflicting opinions. Additionally, the MBCE was recently asked to testify before the Office of Administrative Hearings at a hearing regarding rules initiated by the MNDPS. The subject matter at the hearing was related to the authority of doctors of chiropractic to perform examinations of school bus drivers, which are very much the same as the examinations for interstate truck drivers.


In order to resolve these issues, the MBCE is hereby requesting clarification as to which of the two Attorney's General opinions will control the question of the authority of doctors of chiropractic to sign the required health certificates as well as performing the required underlying examinations of truck drivers or bus drivers operating under the requirements of MNDOT or MNDPS. Such clarification will be necessary for the MBCE to appropriately carry out its functions with respect to doctors of chiropractic performing such examinations, and who may be the subject of a complaint for doing so.

The MBCE thanks you in advance for your time, and looks forward to your response in this matter.

Sincerely,

Larry A. Spicer, D.C.
Executive Director

cc Robert Holley, Akiba Ibura D.C.



STATE OF MINNESOTA

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY III
ATTORNEY GENERAL

April 28, 1997

GOVERNMENT SERVICES SECTION
525 PARK STREET
SUITE 500
ST. PAUL, MN 55103-2106
TELEPHONE: (612) 297-2040

Larry A. Spicer, D.C.
Executive Director
Board of Chiropractic Examiners
University Park Plaza, Suite 300
2829 University Avenue SE
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414



Dear Dr. Spicer:

Thank you for your letter of February 26, 1997, concerning two seemingly inconsistent memoranda issued by this office on the authority of doctors of chiropractic to sign health certificates. As you know, it is common for staff attorneys to provide advice memoranda to client agencies who, in the first instance, are responsible for the exercise of discretion within their areas of policy prerogative and expertise. On occasion, such memoranda have been cited to support competing policy interests, particularly when a range of options is identified. Advice memoranda are advisory only and do not constitute official opinions of the Attorney General. Normally they do not require comment and any inconsistencies are best dealt with in the legislative forum. Under the circumstances presented, including the lack of legislative action since this conflict arose, apparent confusion over the proper disposition of complaints against chiropractors who sign health certificates and the ongoing uncertainty which arose in a recent rulemaking proceeding regarding school bus driver physical examinations, we recognize the need for clarification.

Federal law explicitly states that doctors of chiropractic, like physician assistants, advanced practice nurses and doctors of medicine, qualify as "health care professionals" under Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regulations. It is these FHWA regulations that require a physical examination *by a licensed health care professional* to operate commercial motor vehicles. 49 C.F.R. § 391.41, 43(a)(1) (1993) (emphasis added). FHWA statements in Federal Register, vol. 57, no. 143, conclude that "other health care professionals, including doctors of chiropractic, should be permitted to perform driver physical examination, if they are authorized under State law to conduct such examination" and are proficient in the necessary medical protocols. The question, then, is of the scope of chiropractic practice under Minnesota law.

The May 27, 1994, memorandum to the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) was designed to address whether the Office of Motor Carrier Services of MnDOT had a reasonable basis to reject motor vehicle driver medical certificates signed by chiropractors. The advice memorandum was publicly disclosed by MnDOT. The memorandum construed

Facsimile: (612) 297-2576 • TDD: (612) 282-2525 • Toll Free Lines: (800) 657-3787 (Voice), (800) 366-4812 (TDD)

Minn. Stat. § 148.01, subd. 3, as limiting chiropractors to the use of procedures to prepare a patient for a chiropractic adjustment or to detect only chiropractic conditions. Since completion of a driver's medical certificate requires a number of tests and the possible diagnosis of conditions unrelated to chiropractic conditions, the MnDOT memorandum concluded that doctors of chiropractic lacked the authority under state law to perform all of the necessary tests and, therefore, to sign the corresponding certificate. The memorandum suggested that while chiropractors are expressly authorized to sign health certificates, the pertinent statute should be read to mean that the authority depends on the type of examination conducted.

This view of chiropractors' scope of practice is narrower than that contained in the advice memorandum to the Board of Chiropractic Examiners on the same subject. We attach a copy of the February 21, 1995 memorandum to this Board. This opinion contained a detailed analysis of the authority of doctors of chiropractic to sign health certificates under Minn. Stat. § 148.08. The opinion applied accepted principles of statutory construction to conclude that the authority extends to the execution of the MnDOT commercial motor vehicle driver physical examination form. As the memorandum explains, chiropractic health certificate authority is analogous to the authority granted under sections 148.01, subd. 3, and 148.08, subd. 2, which substantiates the conclusion that the legislature did not intend to limit chiropractic diagnosis to the detection of only chiropractic conditions or prohibit chiropractors from conducting physical examinations for a variety of purposes. See, e.g., Minn. Stat. § 169.345.

The memorandum provides a detailed analysis of the legislative history of section 148.01, subd. 3, relative to chiropractors' diagnostic authority. Subdivision 3 was adopted in 1975 in its present form following extensive hearings. Transcripts of committee tapes reveal that a significant debate occurred relative to whether diagnosis by doctors of chiropractic should be limited to conditions treatable chiropractically, coextensive with the unrestricted differential diagnosis available to medical doctors, or otherwise defined. The restricted diagnosis option, advanced in the two previous Attorney General's opinions which the MnDOT memorandum referenced, was not enacted. Instead, chiropractors were granted broad diagnostic authority, limited only by prohibitions against the use of invasive procedures and analytical x-rays not involving bones of the skeleton. We find this legislative history, which was not addressed in the MnDOT legal memorandum, very persuasive regarding the breadth of diagnostic authority provided chiropractors and endorse the broader scope of practice definition contained in the February 21, 1995 memorandum to this Board.

Application of this broad diagnostic authority to the content of the MnDOT physical examination appears to indicate that no part of the examination requires the use of prohibited procedures and that the licensure examination requires mastery of the procedures necessary to


perform the physical exam.¹ Based on our review, the examination's elements appear to be both within the training of doctors of chiropractic and covered under Minnesota license examination requirements. It is our legal opinion, based on this analysis, that doctors of chiropractic have the authority to perform the necessary tests required by the MnDOT physical examination form and sign the corresponding certificate.

We will provide a copy of this letter to MnDOT. It is in MnDOT's discretion, of course, to further review the physical examination requirements with the broader scope of practice outlined in this letter in mind. The agency also may seek legislative change or a change in the underlying federal rule.

According to our research, doctors of chiropractic conduct the physical examinations required by FHWA regulations in over 45 states. Federal Register, vol. 57, no. 145. I understand that these numbers are consistent with your recent survey of states. As the FHWA comments note, this physical examination does not require sophisticated diagnosis or treatment. Id. Now that we have clarified a chiropractors' scope of practice under Minnesota law we are hopeful that this matter can be amicably resolved.

Very truly yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY III
Attorney General



LUCINDA E. JESSON
Deputy Attorney General

AG:23920 v1

¹ Minnesota licensure requires passage of Parts II and III of the National Board of Chiropractic Examiners examination. Minn. R. 2500.0720. Parts II and III include extensive testing in the following and numerous other subjects: case history, vital signs; head and neck examinations; thorax and lung examination; cardiovascular examination; abdominal examination; rectal and urogenital examination; clinical diagnosis, including head, eyes, ears, nose and throat; respiratory diseases; cardiovascular diseases; gastrointestinal diseases; genitourinary diseases; infectious diseases; laboratory interpretation, including urinalysis, hematology and serology; orthopedic examination, including the extremities; neurologic examination, including sensory function and reflexes, and sexually transmitted diseases. Id.

SUBJECT: ABILITY OF CHIROPRACTORS TO PERFORM EXAMINATIONS

The following is the opinion of the Administrative Law Judge Alan W. Klein, and confirmed by the Chief Administrative Law Judge Kenneth Nickolai, regarding the breadth of examinations permitted by the scope of practice for Doctors of Chiropractic. While this related to a rules promulgation process pertaining to bus drivers physical exams, the issues are essentially the same. This opinion was executed on January 2, 1998.

STATE OF MINNESOTA
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
FOR THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
DRIVER AND VEHICLE SERVICES DIVISION

In the Matter of the Proposed Rules
of the Department of Public Safety
Governing School Bus Drivers,
Minnesota Rules, Chapter 7414

REPORT OF THE CHIEF
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE


The above-entitled matter came on for review by the Chief Administrative Law Judge pursuant to the provisions of Minn. Stat. § 14.15, subd. 3. Based upon a review of the record in this proceeding, the Chief Administrative Law Judge hereby approves the Report of the Administrative Law Judge in all respects.

In order to correct the defect enumerated by the Administrative Law Judge, the agency shall either not adopt the portion of the proposed amendment which conflicts with existing statutes or modify the rule and follow the procedure for adopting substantially different rules. The procedure for adopting substantially different rules is set out in Minn. Rule 1400.2110.

If the agency chooses to take the action recommended by the Administrative Law Judge, it shall submit to the Chief Administrative Law Judge a copy of the rules as initially published in the State Register, a copy of the rules as proposed for final adoption in the form required by the State Register for final publication, and a copy of the agency's Order Adopting Rules. The Chief Administrative Law Judge will then make a determination as to whether the defects have been corrected and whether the modifications in the rules are substantially different.

Should the agency make changes in the rules other than those recommended by the Administrative Law Judge, it shall also submit the complete record to the Chief Administrative Law Judge for a review on the issue of substantial change.

Dated this 12th day of January, 1998.


KENNETH A. NICKOLAI
Acting Chief Administrative Law Judge

STATE OF MINNESOTA
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
FOR THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
DRIVER AND VEHICLE SERVICES DIVISION

In the Matter of the Proposed Rules
of the Department of Public Safety
Governing School Bus Drivers,
Minnesota Rules, Chapter 7414

REPORT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing before Administrative Law Judge Allan W. Klein on November 5, 1997 in St. Paul, Minnesota.

This Report is part of a rulemaking proceeding held pursuant to Minn. Stat. §§ 14.05 to 14.20 (1996) to hear public comment, to determine whether the Department of Public Safety (hereinafter DPS or Department) has fulfilled all relevant substantive and procedural requirements of law applicable to the adoption of the proposed rules, whether the proposed rules are needed and reasonable, and whether or not modifications to the rules proposed by the Department after initial publication are impermissible, substantial changes.

The Department's hearing panel consisted of Jane Nelson, Valerie Jensen and Wayne Jerrow.

The record remained open for the submission of initial written comments until November 25. Following a response period, the rulemaking record closed for all purposes on December 4.

This Report must be available for review to all interested persons upon request for at least five working days before the Department takes any further action on the proposed amendments. The Department may then adopt a final rule, or modify or withdraw its proposed amendments.

Pursuant to the provisions of Minn. Stat. § 14.15, subd. 3, this Report has been submitted to the Chief Administrative Law Judge for his approval of an adverse Finding. If the Chief Administrative Law Judge approves the adverse Finding of this Report, he will advise the Department of actions which will correct the defect and the Department may not adopt the rule until the Chief Administrative Law Judge determines that the defect has been corrected.

If the Department elects to adopt the suggested actions of the Chief Administrative Law Judge and makes no other changes and the Chief Administrative Law Judge determines that the defects have been corrected, then the Department may proceed to adopt the rule and submit it to the Revisor of Statutes for a review of the form. If the Department makes changes in the rule other than those suggested by the Administrative Law Judge and the Chief Administrative Law Judge, then it shall submit the rule, with the complete record, to the Chief Administrative Law Judge for a review of the changes before adopting it and submitting it to the Revisor of Statutes.

If the Department files the rule with the Secretary of State, it shall give notice on the day of filing to all persons who requested that they be informed of the filing.

Based upon all of the testimony, exhibits and written comments, the Administrative Law Judge makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

Procedural Requirements

1. On August 27, 1997, the Department requested the scheduling of a hearing and filed the following documents with the Chief Administrative Law Judge:

- A. A copy of the proposed rules certified by the Revisor of Statutes.
- B. The Dual Notice of Hearing proposed to be issued.
- C. A draft Statement of Need and Reasonableness (SONAR).
- D. A Notice Plan, and a request for prior approval of the Plan.

2. On August 28, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge approved the Notice Plan.

3. On September 18, 1997, the Department mailed the Notice of Hearing to all persons and associations who had registered their names with the it for the purpose of receiving such notice. On that date, it also mailed a copy of the Notice, the Rules, and the SONAR to all members of the School Bus Safety Advisory Committee. Copies of the Notice and the Rules were also mailed on that date to an extensive list of persons and organizations who had expressed interest in the rules, or who the Department thought might be interested in them. See Ex. 15 for a list of these persons and organizations. In addition, copies of

the Notice were sent to all Deputy Registrars, driver licensing agents, and driver examining sites around the state, along with a request to post the Notice in a conspicuous place. The Department also posted the Notice, the Rules and the SONAR on the Department's Web page. Finally, the Department faxed or sent a press release announcing the proposal of the rules and the availability of the Notice, Rules and SONAR to all print and major electronic media in the state.

4. On September 22, 1997, the Dual Notice of Hearing and a copy of the proposed rules were published at 22 State Register 487.

5. On the day of the hearing, the Department placed the following documents into the record:

- A copy of the Department's Request for Comment dated March 19, 1997 and a certificate of mailing the Request to the Department's rulemaking list and the School Bus Safety Advisory Committee.

- A copy of 21 State Register 1413, March 31, 1997, containing the publication of the Request for Comment.

- A letter, dated April 10, 1997, to the Minnesota Chiropractic Association, enclosing a draft of the rule, and indicating that the Department would propose no change in its existing policy requiring physicians to perform school bus endorsement medical examinations.

- A memorandum from Major Dennis Lazenberry, State Patrol Division, dated July 15, 1997, indicating that the School Bus Safety Advisory Committee endorsed the draft rule amendments.

- A letter dated September 13, 1997, to the Legislative Reference Library submitting the SONAR.

- A letter from the Minnesota Chiropractic Association dated October 7, 1997 (received October 15, 1997) requesting a change in the rule or a public hearing on part 7414.1100. Enclosed were letters from 32 signatories requesting a public hearing, and various materials in support of the change sought by the Association.

- A letter dated October 13, 1997 from the Minnesota Nurses Association commenting on part 7414.1100, but not requesting a public hearing.

- All materials filed with the Administrative Law Judge by the Minnesota Chiropractic Association and the Department in connection with the Judge's Prehearing Order (discussed more fully below).

-- A letter dated November (sic -- should have been October) 16, received October 20, from the St. Paul Public Schools requesting a public hearing.

-- Twenty-six letters dated October 10, 1997, received October 22, 1997, from Hoglund Transportation, Inc. employees requesting a public hearing on part 7414.1100.

-- Various comments filed after the October 22 deadline.

-- The Department's Notice of Hearing which was sent to those who requested a hearing and other interested parties, dated October 28, 1997, with a list of all parties to whom the notice was sent.

All of the above-mentioned documents have been available for inspection at the Office of Administrative Hearings from the date of filing.

The initial period for submission of written comment and statements remained open through November 25, 1997, the period having been extended by order of the Administrative Law Judge to 20 calendar days following the hearing. The record finally closed on December 4, the fifth business day following the close of the comment period.

Prehearing Motion and Ruling

6. On October 14, 1997, the Department filed a letter with the Administrative Law Judge, asking for a determination of the validity of the requests for hearing which had been filed by the Minnesota Chiropractic Association and various persons associated with it. The gist of the Department's position was that the requests for hearing were invalid because they asked for a hearing on an issue which was not "fair game" for consideration in this rulemaking proceeding. Attached to the Department's letter were numerous documents outlining the history of the existing rule at issue and varying interpretations of it over the years. (DPS Exhibit 28)

7. The Administrative Law Judge faxed a copy of the Department's letter to the Minnesota Chiropractic Association and offered them the opportunity to comment on it.

8. On October 21, 1997, the Minnesota Chiropractic Association did file a response, generally opposing the Department's motion. Attached to the response were a number of documents supporting the Association's view.

9. On October 28, 1997, the Administrative Law Judge issued a Prehearing Order which held that he would not declare the requests for hearing

to be invalid based upon the record before him at that time, but that he would review the matter further after the hearing when all affected parties had an opportunity to comment on the issue. This Order was faxed to the Department and the Association on October 28.

10. Upon further review, the Administrative Law Judge now decides that the rule at issue is "fair game" for comment. This is discussed in Finding 21 below.

Overview of Judge's Analysis

11. Minn. Stat. § 14.50 requires the Administrative Law Judge to take notice of the degree to which the Department has demonstrated the need for and reasonableness of its proposed rules with an affirmative presentation of facts. Minn. Stat. § 14.14, subd. 2 requires the Department to make an affirmative presentation of facts establishing the need for and reasonableness of its proposed rules. That statute also allows the Department to rely upon facts presented by others on the record during the rule proceeding to support the proposal. In this case, the Department prepared an extensive Statement of Need and Reasonableness ("SONAR") to support the adoption of each of the proposed amendments. At the hearing, the Department supplemented the SONAR, both in prepared statements and also by dialogue with members of the public throughout the hearing session. The Department also submitted written post-hearing comments, both at the end of the initial comment period and at the end of the responsive comment period.

In addition to need and reasonableness, the Administrative Law Judge must assess whether the Legislature has granted statutory authority to the Department, whether rule adoption procedure was complied with, whether the rule grants undue discretion to Department personnel, whether the rule is unconstitutional or illegal, whether the rule constitutes an undue delegation of authority to another, or whether the proposed language is impermissibly vague.

12. Most of the amendments proposed by the Department drew no criticism. This Report is generally limited to reviewing those proposed amendments that received significant critical comment or otherwise need to be examined. Accordingly, this Report will not discuss each subpart of each rule, nor will it respond to each comment which was submitted. Persons or groups who do not find their particular comments referenced in this Report should know that each and every submission has been read and considered. Moreover, because most of the proposed rules were not opposed, and were adequately supported by the SONAR, a detailed discussion of each section of the proposed rules is unnecessary. The Administrative Law Judge specifically finds that the Department has demonstrated the need for and reasonableness of provisions of the rule that are not discussed in this Report, that such provisions are within the

Department's statutory authority noted above, and that there are no other problems that prevent their adoption.

13. Where changes were made to the rule after publication in the State Register, the Administrative Law Judge must determine if the new language is substantially different from that which was proposed originally. Minn. Stat. § 14.05, subd. 2 and Minn. Rule pt. 1400.2240, subp. 7. Upon review, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the changes proposed by the Department which differ from the rule as published in the State Register are not substantially different from the language published in the State Register.

Statutory Authority and Nature of the Proposed Rule Amendments

14. Minn. Stat. § 299A.01, subd. 6 grants the Commissioner of Public Safety the power to "promulgate such rules pursuant to chapter 14 as are necessary to carry out the purposes of Laws 1969, chapter 1129." Chapter 1129, art. 1, § 18, subd. 2 states:

All the powers and duties now vested in or imposed upon the Department of Highways and the Commissioner of Highways in regard to drivers' licensing and safety responsibilities as prescribed in Minnesota Statutes 1967, chapters 169, 170 and 171 are hereby transferred to, vested in, and imposed upon the Commissioner of Public Safety.

More particularly, Minn. Stat. § 171.321, subd. 2 authorizes the Commissioner of Public Safety to:

prescribe rules governing the physical qualifications of school bus drivers and tests required to obtain a school bus endorsement. The rules must provide that an applicant for a school bus endorsement or renewal is exempt from the physical qualifications and medical examination required to operate a school bus upon providing evidence of being medically examined and certified within the preceding 24 months as physically qualified to operate a commercial motor vehicle, pursuant to Code of Federal Regulations, Title 49, Part 391, subpart E, or rules of the Commissioner of Transportation incorporating those federal regulations.

15. The Administrative Law Judge concludes that, except as noted below, the Department does have statutory authority to adopt the proposed rule amendments.

Section-by-Section Analysis

16. Minnesota Rules Chapter 7414 governs the qualifications of an individual to obtain and maintain a school bus endorsement on the individual's state driver's license. Under Minn. Stat. § 171.321, the individual must first obtain a class A, B or C commercial driver's license with a school bus endorsement which authorizes the person to drive a school bus. The Department is seeking to amend existing rule part 7414.1100 by replacing the disease and condition specific language with a general reference to the examination form and medical certificate of Code of Federal Regulations, title 49, section 391.43 (f) and (g). The Department is also proposing to eliminate the phrase "reputable physician designated by the local school authority" and replace it with the phrase "physician licensed under Minnesota Statutes, chapter 147". The Department does not want to alter its long standing policy of allowing only physicians to perform the required physical examination and to complete the examination form and certificate. The only controversial issue in this proceeding was the Department's "physician only" policy and whether certain other health care practitioners should be allowed to perform these physical examinations.

7414.1100 Physician's Certificate

17. The Department has proposed the following amendment to existing part 7414.1100:

~~An applicant for a school bus driver's endorsement shall be in good physical and mental health, able bodied, and free from communicable disease. As evidence of physical fitness and mental alertness, the applicant shall submit to a physical examination by a reputable physician designated by the local school authorities; and the physician's certificate of physical fitness and mental alertness shall accompany the application for school bus driver's endorsement when presented to the Department of Public Safety.~~
An applicant for an initial endorsement on the applicant's driver's license to drive a school bus must be physically qualified to operate a school bus. As evidence of physical qualification, the applicant shall submit to the department the form specified in part 7414.1300 completed by a physician licensed under Minnesota Statutes, chapter 147, when the application for the school bus endorsement on the driver's license is made to the department.

18. In its SONAR, the Department stated that the proposed amendment to existing part 7414.1100 is intended to address three issues. (1) The existing disease or condition specific language is proposed to be replaced by a general reference to the examination form and medical certificate proposed in part 7414.1300 which adopts the form and certificate required by Code of Federal

Regulations, title 49, section 391.43, paragraphs (f) and (g). The Department maintains that such replacement is reasonable because the Department is proposing to replace the physical qualifications in part 7414.1200 with the standards in Code of Federal Regulations, title 49, section 391.41. (2) The proposed amendment also clarifies that it is DPS that must receive the examination form and medical certificate. (3) The Department also proposes to eliminate the phrase "reputable physician designated by the local school authority" and replace it with the phrase "physician licensed under Minnesota Statutes, chapter 147". The Department explains that this proposed amendment is reasonable because it is not DPS or local school authorities that assess the reputation of physicians but the Board of Medical Practice under the provisions of Minnesota Statutes, chapter 147. (SONAR, pp. 23-24).

19. The majority of the comments received by the Department and the Administrative Law Judge came from members of the Minnesota Chiropractic Association (MCA), the Minnesota Board of Chiropractic Examiners (MBCE), and the Minnesota Medical Association (MMA). The controversy concerns the provision in part 7414.1100 which allows only licensed physicians to complete the required medical examination form for school bus driver endorsements.

20. Initially, the Department maintained that it was not opening up this rule to propose a change to the existing rule requirement that a physician perform the medical examination for school bus driver endorsements and thus the issue of who could perform them was not "fair game" for comment. According to the Department, the determination of who is qualified to perform the physical examination "has been addressed in previous rulemaking proceedings and determinations as to consistency with existing state laws and rules". (SONAR, p. 13; DPS Exhibits 6, 28-1 to 28-11, and 41).

The MCA, in response, argued that the proposed language's reference to chapter 147 was indeed new language which opened up the issue for debate. Attached to the MCA's responses was a copy of a recent (April 1997) letter from Deputy Attorney General Lucinda Jesson affirming an earlier (May 1994) memorandum from Assistant Attorney General Robert Holley, which opined that the legislative history of Minn. Stat. § 148.01, subd. 3, coupled with a 1993 amendment to Minn. Stat. § 171.321, subd. 2, and a review of all past legislation, litigation and other materials compelled the conclusion that chiropractors could perform the examination and sign the certificate for MnDOT commercial motor vehicle operations. MCA argued that the language proposed by the Board was in direct contradiction of the statutes under the Jesson and Holley opinions, and the rule was "fair game" for comment.

21. The Administrative Law Judge now determines that the proposed language is arguably different enough from the existing language that the rule is "fair game" for comment and review.

Comments in Support of or in Opposition to Allowing Chiropractors to Perform the Required Physical Examination

22. The MCA challenges the Department's position that only physicians may perform the required medical examination for school bus driver endorsements. The MCA maintains that doctors of chiropractic should be allowed to perform the required physical examinations and sign the health certificates. In support of its position the MCA cites to the explicit language of Minn. Stat. § 148.08, subd. 2, which states that chiropractors shall be entitled to sign health and death certificates, and to the definition of "medical examiner" in the Code of Federal Regulations, title 49, section 391.05, which includes doctors of chiropractic, advanced practice nurses and physician assistants. In addition, the MCA points to advisory memoranda issued by Assistant Attorney General Robert Holley and Deputy Attorney General Lucinda Jesson which each reached the conclusion that chiropractors may perform physical examinations and sign corresponding health certificates for commercial motor vehicle drivers.

23. Since 1990, staff attorneys of the Attorney General's Office have issued conflicting advisory memoranda on the question of the authority of chiropractors to sign health certificates. These memoranda have not been in the form of official attorney general opinions and are advisory only. They do not have the force or effect of law, nor do they establish any legal precedent. The relevant memoranda are summarized as follows:

(a) On December 4, 1990, Jacquelyn Albright, Assistant Attorney General, submitted a memorandum to Gary Cunningham, Assistant Director of the Department's Driver and Vehicle Services Division, on the issue of whether chiropractors are authorized to sign school bus driver physical and health certificates. Based on a narrow interpretation of the scope of chiropractic practice under Minn. Stat. § 148.01, Ms. Albright concluded that chiropractors were not authorized to perform school bus driver physical examinations. (DPS Exhibit 50).

(b) On May 27, 1994, Melissa Wright, Assistant Attorney General, submitted a memoranda to Elizabeth Parker, attorney for the Office of Motor Carriers, on the question of whether chiropractors may sign medical certificates on behalf of motor carrier driver applicants. Ms. Wright construed the scope of practice of chiropractors to be limited to preparing or detecting a chiropractic condition. Consequently, Ms. Wright concluded that until the legislature authorizes chiropractors to conduct physical examinations for purposes other than to detect chiropractic conditions, the Office of Motor Carriers Services had a reasonable basis to reject medical certificates signed by chiropractors. (DPS Exhibit 49).

(c) On February 21, 1995, Robert Holley, Assistant Attorney General, submitted a memorandum to Larry Spicer, Executive Director of the Board of Chiropractic Examiners, on the authority of chiropractors to perform Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) physical exams. The memorandum provides a detailed analysis of the legislative history of section 148.01, subdivision 3, relative to a chiropractors' diagnostic authority. Based on his analysis, Holley concluded that doctors of chiropractic are authorized to sign MnDOT physical examination forms. (DPS Exhibit 26).

(d) By letter dated April 28, 1997, Lucinda Jesson, Deputy Attorney General, responded to concerns raised by Larry Spicer, Executive Director of the Board of Chiropractic Examiners, regarding these conflicting advice memoranda. Referring to Assistant Attorney General Robert Holley's earlier memo on the scope of chiropractic practice under Minn. Stat. § 148.01, Jesson concluded that the legislature did not intend to limit the chiropractic diagnosis to the detection of chiropractic conditions or to prohibit chiropractors from conducting physical examinations for a variety of purposes. Consequently, Jesson stated that it was the legal opinion of the Attorney General's Office that doctors of chiropractic have the authority to perform the necessary tests required by the MnDOT physical examination form and to sign the corresponding certificates. (DPS Exhibit 25).

24. In its remarks at the hearing, the Department emphasized that it has been the long-standing practice of the Department to have the medical examination for school bus driver endorsements performed by physicians only. The Department further stated that it cannot adopt rules which may be construed as expanding or interpreting the scope of practice of other health care professionals absent specific statutory direction. Consequently, the Department maintained that the most prudent course of action is to continue the current practice that a physician perform the medical examination. (DPS Exhibit 41).

25. On November 25, 1997, the Administrative Law Judge received post-hearing comments from Larry Spicer, Executive Director of the Minnesota Board of Chiropractic Examiners (MBCE). In his comments, Dr. Spicer argues that the issue to be determined is whether the Department has the legal authority to exclude chiropractors from performing physical examinations and signing health certificates in light of Minn. Stat. § 148.08, subd. 2; 49 C.F.R. 391.43; and the advisory memoranda of Assistant Attorney General Robert Holley and Deputy Attorney General Lucinda Jesson.

26. On November 25, 1997, the ALJ also received a response from the Minnesota Medical Association (MMA). The MMA supports the Department's proposed rules. In its post-hearing response, the MMA reiterated the comments presented at the hearing by Dr. Paul Sanders. The MMA contends that the examinations specified in Minn. R. 7414.1100 are thorough medical

examinations requiring medical examiners trained in diagnosing and managing medical problems. According to the MMA, the scope of the examination falls within the parameters of the definition of the practice of medicine and falls outside the scope of chiropractic practice as defined by Minn. Stat. § 148.01, subdivisions 1-3. Consequently, the MMA argues that the examinations should be left to licensed physicians.

27. The Department also submitted post-hearing comments received by the ALJ on December 4, 1997. The Department argues that it has incorporated by reference only the set of physical qualifications contained in 49 C.F.R. § 391.41 and not the definition of "medical examiner" contained in 49 § 390.5. The Department insists that it has the discretion to select what provisions of the federal regulations it will incorporate by reference and that it does not have to follow the definition of "medical examiner" contained in C.F.R. § 390.5. Even so, the Department points out that the definition of a "medical examiner" in 49 C.F.R. §390.5 contains the qualification that the practitioner must be licensed, certified or registered "in accordance with applicable State laws and regulations". It is the Department's position that performing physical examinations is outside the scope of practice for chiropractors and consequently not in accordance with applicable Minnesota laws and regulations. The Department argues that it does not have the authority to determine or enforce the chiropractors' scope of practice.

Comments in Support of Allowing Nurse Practitioners to Perform the Required Physical Examinations

28. By letter dated October 13, 1997, the Minnesota Nurses Association (MNA) proposed that Minn. R. 7414.1100 be amended to allow Nurse Practitioners to perform the physical examination. According to the MNA, nurse practitioners are specifically hired by most medical clinics to perform basic physical examinations. Such examinations are within nurse practitioners' scope of practice. Moreover, all insurance companies and health maintenance organizations in Minnesota reimburse Nurse Practitioners for providing physical examinations. The MNA also points out that limiting the performance of the physical examinations to only physicians requires clinics and patients to use a more expensive health care provider.

29. On November 6, 1997 the ALJ received a letter from Linda Lindeke, Ph.D., R.N., C.P.N.P., in support of allowing nurse practitioners to perform the required physical examination of school bus endorsement applicants. Ms. Lindeke is an Assistant Professor at the University of Minnesota School of Nursing and has been an educator of nurse practitioners for nearly twenty years. Ms. Lindeke pointed out that Nurse Practitioners perform physical examinations and that such examinations are accepted both for high school athletes and as forensic evidence in child abuse trials. Ms. Lindeke contends that the Department's position that only physicians be allowed to perform the required

physical examination is very regressive and not in step with current health care thinking. (DPS Exhibit 42).

30. The Department's position on these comments is the same as its position on the chiropractors: that the rule should not be fair game for debate, but if it is, then the appropriate resolution is physicians only.

Analysis of Part 7414.1100 as to Legality

31. The Department's specific statutory authority to promulgate the rules relative to school bus endorsements is contained in Minn. Stat. § 171.321, subd. 2 which states as follows:

The commissioner of public safety shall prescribe rules governing the physical qualifications of school bus drivers and tests required to obtain a school bus endorsement. The rules must provide that an applicant for a school bus endorsement or renewal is exempt from the physical qualifications and medical examination required to operate a school bus upon providing evidence of being medically examined and certified within the preceding 24 months as physically qualified to operate a commercial motor vehicle, pursuant to Code of Federal Regulations, title 49, part 391, subpart E, or rules of the commissioner of transportation incorporating those federal regulations.

32. In 1993, Minn. Stat. § 171.321, subdivision 2 was amended to compel DPS to accept federal motor carrier certificates from applicants for school bus endorsements in lieu of the medical examination required by Minnesota Rule parts 7414.1100 to 7414.1400. According to the Department, roughly twenty percent of the applicants for an endorsement present a motor carrier certificate. The Department states that it has interpreted section 171.321, subdivision 2 as requiring DPS to accept federal motor carrier certificates from school bus endorsement applicants residing in Minnesota if the motor carrier certificates were obtained within the past 24 months. (DPS Exhibit 41). The exemption governs intrastate school bus drivers if the applicant had a medical certificate or medical examination form issued under 49 C.F.R., part 391, subpart E within the past 24 months.

33. The examination form and certificate that must be submitted to the Department are specified in Minn. R. 7414.1300. This rule part states that the examination form and medical certificate must substantially comply with Code of Federal Regulations, title 49, section 391.43, paragraphs (f) and (g). According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regulations, the required physical

examination for commercial motor vehicle driver applicants must be performed by a licensed "medical examiner". 49 C.F.R. § 391.43(a)(1).

34. Section 390.5 of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 49 defines the term "medical examiner" as:

[A] person who is licensed, certified and/or registered, in accordance with applicable State laws and regulations, to perform physical examinations. The term includes, but is not limited to, doctors of medicine, doctors of osteopathy, physician assistants, advanced practice nurses, and doctors of chiropractic.

35. In addition, Minn. Stat. § 148.08, subd. 2 provides:

Chiropractors shall be subject to the same rules and regulations, both municipal and state, that govern other licensed doctors or physicians in the control of contagious and infectious diseases, and shall be entitled to sign health and death certificates, and to all rights and privileges of other doctors or physicians in all matters pertaining to the public health, except prescribing internal drugs or the practice of medicine, physical therapy, surgery and obstetrics.

36. The scope of chiropractic practice is described in Minn. Stat. § 148.01, subd. 3 and includes:

. . . those noninvasive means of clinical, physical, and laboratory measures and analytical X-rays of the bones of the skeleton which are necessary to make a determination of the presence or absence of a chiropractic condition. The practice of chiropractic may include procedures which are used to prepare the patient for chiropractic adjustment or to complement the chiropractic adjustment. The procedures may not be used as independent therapies or separately from chiropractic adjustment. . . .

37. The Department maintains that its proposed rule part 7414.1100, which limits the completion of physical examination forms for school bus endorsements to physicians, is not in conflict with any statute. The Department contends that it is incorporating by reference only the medical examination form and certificate specified in 49 C.F.R. § 391.43 (f) and (g) and not the broad definition of "medical examiner" found at 49 C.F.R. § 390.5. The Department asserts that it is not compelled in this proceeding to apply all of the standards applicable to interstate motor carrier drivers to intrastate school bus drivers.

However, even if the Department were required to follow the definition of "medical examiner" used in 49 C.F.R. § 391.43, the Department maintains that the definition contains the qualification that medical examiners be licensed, certified or registered "in accordance with applicable State laws and regulations" to perform physical examinations. The Department argues that under Minnesota state laws, chiropractors are not licensed to perform physical examinations because such examinations are outside the scope of practice for chiropractors. The Department bases its opinion on a narrow construction of Minn. Stat. § 148.01, and ignores the clear mandate of section 148.08, subd. 2 expressly authorizing chiropractors to sign health and death certificates. According to the Department, Minn. Stat. § 148.01 limits chiropractors' scope of practice to the use of procedures to prepare a patient for chiropractic adjustment or to detect chiropractic conditions. In addition, the Department contends that if it were to allow doctors of chiropractic to perform the required physical examinations, the Department would in essence be expanding the chiropractors' scope of practice without legislative authorization. Consequently, the Department maintains that the most reasonable and prudent course of action is to continue the Department's long-standing practice of only allowing physicians to perform the required physical examinations for school bus driver endorsements.

38. The Administrative Law Judge finds the Department's proposed amendment to Minnesota Rules part 7414.1100 limiting the performance of physical examinations and the completion of examination forms and certificates for school bus endorsement applicants to licensed physicians to be in conflict with two existing statutes. First, Minn. Stat. § 148.08, subdivision 2 expressly grants authority to chiropractors to sign health certificates. The examination form and certificate referred to in part 7414.1300, which must substantially comply with the form prescribed in 49 C.F.R. § 391.43, may reasonably be regarded as a health certificate within the meaning of Minn. Stat. § 148.08, subd. 2. Moreover, such authority to sign health certificates indicates an intent on the part of the legislature to permit chiropractors to conduct the physical examination that underlies the health certificate. Consequently, the "physician only" provision of proposed part 7414.1100 contradicts and is inconsistent with the express authority granted chiropractors in Minn. Stat. § 148.08, subd. 2.

39. Secondly, the Department has incorporated by reference into Minnesota Rules chapter 7414 the medical examination form and certificate prescribed by federal motor carrier regulations at 49 C.F.R. § 391.43. These regulations require that the medical examination of applicants be performed by a "licensed medical examiner" as defined in 49 C.F.R. § 390.5. The term "medical examiner" is defined in 49 C.F.R. § 390.5 as including doctors of chiropractic, advanced practice nurses, and physician assistants who are licensed, certified or registered to perform physical examinations. As described in the next Finding, the scope of practice for chiropractors does include performing these types of

physical examinations. Consequently, the Department's "physician only" provision of proposed part 7414.1100 conflicts with 49 C.F.R. § 391.43.

40. The ALJ is persuaded by the exhaustive research and analysis of Assistant Attorney General Robert Holley in his advisory memorandum dated February 21, 1995 (DPS Exhibit 26) which demonstrates that a dispositive amendment to Minn. Stat. § 148.01, subdivision 3, was passed (in 1975) after the legislature discussed at length the appropriate scope of diagnostic work which chiropractors should be allowed to perform, and then determined not to limit chiropractic diagnosis to the detection of only chiropractic conditions or to prohibit doctors of chiropractic from conducting physical examinations for a variety of purposes.

41. Finally, the Department has not established the legality of excluding nurse practitioners or physician assistants from performing the required physical examination for school bus endorsements. According to the Minnesota Nurses Association, the taking of health histories and the performance of physical examinations are within the scope of practice of nurse practitioners. Excluding these practitioners (in Minnesota, nurse practitioners are the same as advanced practice nurses in the federal scheme) from performing physical examinations and completing the required examination form and certificate conflicts with the existing provisions in 49 C.F.R. § 391.43 incorporated by reference at Minnesota Rules 7414.1300.

42. An agency may not adopt rules which conflict with existing statutes. Green v. Whirlpool Corp., 389 N.W.2d 504, 506 (Minn. 1986); J.C. Penny Co., Inc. v. Commissioner of Economic Sec., 353 N.W.2d 243, 246 (Minn. App. 1984). When the words of a law are clear and unambiguous, amendments to the law must be made by the legislature in the form of a statute. They cannot be made by the Department in the form of a rule. J.C. Penny, 353 N.W.2d at 246. When an administrative rule conflicts with the plain meaning of a statute, the statute controls. Special School Dist. No. 1 v. Dunham, 498 N.W.2d 441, 445 (Minn. 1993). In the instant matter, the ALJ finds that the language of Minn. Stat. § 148.08, subd. 2 is clear and unambiguous with respect to the authority of chiropractors to sign health certificates. Likewise, 49 C.F.R. § 391.43, specifically includes chiropractors, advanced practice nurses, and physician assistants licensed, certified or registered to perform physical examinations in its definition of "medical examiner". Consequently, the Department's proposed rule part 7414.1100 excluding chiropractors and other practitioners from completing the physical examination forms conflicts with both Minn. Stat. §§ 148.08, subd. 2 and 171.321, subd. 2 and thus is invalid.

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Administrative Law Judge makes the following:

CONCLUSIONS


1. That the Minnesota Department of Public Safety gave proper notice of the hearing in this matter.
2. That the Department has fulfilled the procedural requirements of Minn. Stat. §§ 14.14, subds. 1, 1a and 14.14, subd. 2, and all other procedural requirements of law or rule.
3. That the Department has demonstrated its statutory authority to adopt the proposed rules and has fulfilled all other substantive requirements of law or rule within the meaning of Minn. Stat. §§ 14.05, subd. 1, 14.15, subd. 3 and 14.50 (i)(ii), except as noted at Finding 42.
4. That the Department has documented the need for and reasonableness of its proposed rules with an affirmative presentation of facts in the record within the meaning of Minn. Stat. §§ 14.14, subd. 2 and 14.50 (iii).
5. That the amendments and additions to the proposed rules which were suggested by the Department after publication of the proposed rules in the State Register do not result in rules which are substantially different from the proposed rules as published in the State Register within the meaning of Minn. Stat. § 14.15, subd. 3, and Minn. Rule 1400.1000, Subp. 1 and 1400.1100.
6. That due to Conclusion 3, this Report has been submitted to the Chief Administrative Law Judge for his approval pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 14.15, subd. 3.
7. That any Findings which might properly be termed Conclusions and any Conclusions which might properly be termed Findings are hereby adopted as such.
8. That a finding or conclusion of need and reasonableness in regard to any particular rule subsection does not preclude and should not discourage the Department from further modification of the proposed rules based upon an examination of the public comments, provided that no substantial change is made from the proposed rules as originally published, and provided that the rule finally adopted is based upon facts appearing in this rule hearing record.

Based upon the foregoing Conclusions, the Administrative Law Judge makes the following:

RECOMMENDATION

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED: that the proposed rules be adopted except where specifically otherwise noted above.

Dated this 2nd day of January 1998.



ALLAN W. KLEIN
Administrative Law Judge

Reported: Tape Recorded;
No Transcript Prepared

MEMORANDUM

Ultimately, the issue of whether chiropractors, nurse practitioners or other health care practitioners should be allowed to perform physical examinations and sign health certificates for school bus driver endorsements is most appropriately addressed by the legislature. However, absent a clear legislative directive, the ALJ must determine the legality of the Department's proposed rule amendment in light of existing statutes. The fact that it has been the long standing practice of the Department to allow only physicians to perform the required physical examination is insufficient to support the legality of the rule in light of the existing statutes. Based on an examination of the entire rule record, the Administrative Law Judge must conclude that the Department's proposal that only physicians perform the physical examination to be contrary to existing statutes, and thus it cannot be adopted.

AWK